

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 07/06/1999 RODNEY L. CLARK M3477.0000/P 09/347,427 EXAMINER 12/11/2003 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP VARGOT, MATHIEU D 2101 L STREET NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					<u></u>
		Application	No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/347,427		CLARK ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Mathieu D.		1732	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the d	over sheet with the	correspondence ado	Iress
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt - Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reduce to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature to received by the Office later than three months after the mail and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event eply within the statuto od will apply and will a ute, cause the applic	t, however, may a reply be to ory minimum of thirty (30) da expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron ation to become ABANDON	imely filed sys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this con ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	mmunication.
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	October 2003.			
2a)[This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non	-final.		
3)□	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) Claim(s) 3.4.12-14 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 3.4.12-14 and 17-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. 					
Attachmer			_		
2) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)			ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s Patent Application (PTO	



Application/Control Number: 09/347,427

Art Unit: 1732

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 12-14 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hambright in view of Maus et al –769 (see Figs. 11 and 12 and column 24, lines 40+).

Hambright discloses the basic claimed mold apparatus and method for making same as well as optical elements therefrom, with mold 14 constituting the instant single metal puck or second mold unit and mold 16 in Hambright constituting the first mold unit, the primary reference essentially failing to teach the first mold unit having flow passageways and mold pins for defining mold cavities. Note that Hambright is using a typical mold for making optical disks, which would presumably encompass an injection mold or injection/compression mold, such being nothing but conventional in the art.

Maus et al –769 shows mold parts in Figs. 11 and 12 therein which would constitute typical injection molds to make optical disks, and these mold parts contain mold pins and flow passageways. It certainly would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the molds shown in Hambright as shown in Maus et al –769 to allow for injection molding of the optical patterns. Again, the disclosure in Hambright concerning the use of existing A/V disc molding equipment affords one of ordinary skill in the art the luxury of using the teaching in Maus et al –769 concerning particulars of the injection molds. Concerning instant claims 18-20, see Hambright, column 3, lines 29-34.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/347,427

Art Unit: 1732

2.Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Upon reconsideration, the rejection has been restructured using Hambright and Maus et al –769. It is submitted that this combination renders applicant's comments concerning the earlier rejection most and essentially non-probative at this point. Certainly, the optical patterns in the one mold part are shown in Hambright and the mold pins and flow passageways are shown in Maus et al –769.

3.Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 703 308-2621. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 703 305-5493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0661.

M. Vargot December 9, 2003 M-Vugot Mathieu D. Vargot Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732

12/9/03